

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the invention claimed by applicants is fundamentally different from that claimed by LeMay et al. and would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in light of the LeMay et al. claims, either taken alone or in combination with any secondary references. While Mura discloses monitoring conditions of a door, it does not suggest monitoring of both a door and the door lock mechanism separately. While Lucaro teaches a coupler on a gaming device for receiving an operator transponder for recording the identity of the user carrying the transponder and downloading information to the transponder from the gaming machine, there is no suggestion of comparing user identification data to access authorization data to determine whether the user is authorized to access physical areas of the machine and to operate the necessary doors and/or locks to provide that access.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the applicants' claims are clearly patentable over the claims of LeMay et al., either alone or in combination with the secondary references and, therefore, it is respectfully requested that the double patenting rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Attorneys for Assignee
55 East Monroe Street
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803
312-346-8000

By 